

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 6, 11 - 15, 40, 41, 47 - 51 and 57 - 61 were elected by Reply of October 8, 2004 and were pending in the instant application when last examined. Claims 6, 11, 15, and 61 are allowed. Claims 1 - 5, 12 - 14, 40, and 57 - 60 were objected to. Claims 47 - 51 are rejected. This response amends claims 1 - 5, 11 - 14, 40, 41, 47 and 57 - 60 to correct obvious typographical errors and obvious errors in usage. No new matter is being added and claims 1 - 6, 11 - 15, 40, 41, 47 - 51 and 57 - 61 are pending in the instant application. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

### **Objections to claims**

In item 2, the office action objects to claims 1 - 5, 12 - 14 and 40 for reciting “operative to” and claims 57 - 60 for reciting “instructions for causing one or more processors to”. Applicant amends claims 1 - 5, 12 - 14 and 40 to recited “operative to carry out the steps of” instead of “operative to”; claim 57 to recite “A computer readable medium, carrying one or more sequences of instructions, which instructions, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to carry out the steps of” instead of “instructions for causing one or more processors to”; and claims 58 - 60 to recite “instructions for carrying out the steps of” instead of “instructions for causing one or more processors to”. Minor amendments have also been made to correct typographical errors not raised by the office action in allowed claim 11 and claim 41. That the above amendments to the claims have overcome the objections is respectfully submitted.

### **Rejection under 35 USC 101**

In item 3, the office action rejected claims 47 - 51 under the 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory, asserting that “the claims as presented do not claim a technological basis in the body of the claim,” and citing Ex parte Bowman. Applicant would traverse, since the embodiments in the specification are described with reference to computing hardware and associated software, but elects instead to amend claims 47 to recite “displaying at least a portion of the dynamically generated database on a computer display,” in order to obviate the rejection and expedite

allowance. Claims 48 – 51 depend from claim 47 and therefore incorporate this limitation by virtue of this dependence.

**Allowable Subject Matter**


In item 4, the office action indicates that claims 6, 11, 15 and 61 are allowed. The office action also indicates that claims 1 – 5, 12 – 14, 40, and 57 - 60 will be allowable when the claim objections are overcome, and that claims 47 – 51 will be allowable when the 35 USC 101 rejection is overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 41, also in the elected group, should also be allowed for the reasons stated above.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/31/2005  
Fliesler Meyer L.L.P.  
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone (415) 362-3800 x227  
Facsimile (415) 362-2928

By   
Paul A. Durdik  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 37,819